UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/500,639	02/09/2000	Chun-Ming Lu	6978.0097	2896

22852   7590   12/22/2003

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	8

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/500,639	LU ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Jonathan D. Schlaifer	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-12 and 15-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-12 and 15-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 10/10/2003.

2. The objections to the drawings are withdrawn as necessitated by amendment. New

   drawings were received on 10/10/2003. These drawings are acceptable.

3. The objections to the specification are withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

4. Claims 2, 3, 13, 14, and 25 have been cancelled.

5. Claims 1, 4-12, and 15-24 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 24 are

   independent claims. Claims 1, 12, 23, and 24 have been amendmed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. **Claims 1, 12, and 23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by**

   Graber et al. (USPN 5,812,769 – filing date 9/22/1998).

2. **Regarding independent claim 1,** Graber et al. (Graber) discloses: "a method and

   apparatus for redirecting a user from a first location on the WWW to a second location on

   the WWW, wherein relative URL addressing is used during the redirecting process"

   (Graber on col. 3, lines 16-19). This is equivalent to "forwarding a web address to

   another web address in a network", comprising the steps of:

    a. Receiving a request destined to a first web address including a domain name and a uniform resource identifier (URI) (Graber on col. 3, lines 19-21: teaches receiving an initiating signal to begin forwarding from a first location to a second location; such a signal would inherently be destined to a web address including a domain name and a URI);

    b. Determining a forwarding uniform resource location (URL) that corresponds to the domain name (Graber on col. 3, lines 27-29: teaches how to form a destination URL, which corresponds to the domain name in that the second portion of the URL has been substituted)

    c. Redirecting the request to a second web address that corresponds the to forwarding URL (Graber on col. 3, lines 31-34: teaches how to redirect the user to a new location in accordance with the forwarding URL)

3. **Regarding independent claim 12,** a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

4. **Regarding independent claim 23,** an apparatus with a memory and a processor for performing the steps recited in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 4 and 15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Horstmann et al (USPN 5,995,099 – filing date 6/10/1996).**

6. **Regarding dependent claim 4,** Graber discloses the method of claim 1. However, Graber does not explicitly disclose the details of the determining step, wherein the determining step comprises determining whether a search for forwarding information can be completed, and indicating that there has been a system error based on the determination that the search cannot be completed. However, in Figure 5, Steps 52 and 53, Horstmann et al. (Horstmann) teaches that one should attempt to see if pages exist in order to establish if links "correspond with valid page addresses" (col. 5, lines 9-10). Subsequently, an error message is generated if there is a problem (col. 5, lines 10-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add an error check and message feature onto Graber's invention to determine if a search for forwarding information could be completed and to indicate that there has been a system error based on the determination that the search cannot be completed.

7. **Regarding dependent claim 15,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

8. **Claims 5 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Horstmann et al (USPN 5,995,099 – filing date 6/10/1996) as applied to claims 4 and 15 above, and further in view of Ogle et al. (USPN 6,052,736 – filing date 3/31/1997).**

9. **Regarding dependent claim 5,** Graber and Horstmann disclose the method of claim 4. However, they fail to disclose directing the request to a default web address based on a a determination that a search could be completed and no forwarding URL that corresponds to the domain name is found. Ogle et al. (Ogle) teach that in a network a "datagram may be sent to a default address" to deal with the case "if no direct or indirect route is specified" (col. 2, lines 26-27). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Graber et al. and Horstmann et al.'s work, as in claim 4, and further improve the result by the means of directing web requests to a default address based on a determination that a search could be completed and no forwarding URL that corresponds to the domain name is found in order to deal with the case where no set destination is provided.

10. **Regarding dependent claim 16,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

11. **Claims 6-8 and 17-19 and 24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Muller et al. (USPN 6,128,279 – filing date 6/30/1997), and further in view of Fogg et al. (USPN 6,321,242 – filing date 2/6/1998).**

12. **Regarding dependent claim 6,** Graber discloses the method of claim 1. Graber fails to disclose that the determining step would comprise searching a data file for the forwarding URL. In Muller et al. (Muller), they teach how to use a forwarding database search engine may be used in network routing "for achieving a cost-effective high-performance

switch implementation" (col. 1, lines 14-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a forwarding database (which would necessitate searching a data file for the forward URL) into the design of Graber's invention in order to achieve a cost-effective high-performance routing implementation.

13. **Regarding dependent claim 17,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

14. **Regarding dependent claim 7,** Graber and Muller disclose the method of claim 6. They fail to disclose wherein the data file is periodically updated by a data generator, the data generator performing the steps of extracting forwarding information from a customer database and storing the forwarding information in the data file. Fogg et al. (Fogg, col. 4, lines 45-49) teaches, "When the receiver webmaster changes the uniform resource locator (URL) of a documents (210) the receiver re-liner generates a re-link message" with the motivation "to easily update hypertext links in documents on feeder sites to point to new locations for a receiving site document when the document has been relocated" (lines 62-65, column 1). This would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to improve the results of combining the work of Graber et al. and Muller et al. by adding a data generator that periodically updates a data file by extracting forwarding information from a database and storing the forwarding information in the data file.

15. **Regarding dependent claim 18,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 8,** Graber, Muller, and Fogg disclose the method of claim 7. It is further necessary to have the customer database include a table that associates a domain name with a forwarding URL. Muller et al. teaches how to employ a data table to associates an "IP source address" with an "Internet Protocol (IP) destination address" (col. 13, lines 15-16) to provide "information for making real-time packet forwarding and filtering decisions" (col. 11, lines 66-67). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a similar data table as in Muller that associates the domain name with the forwarding URL in order to provide information for forwarding and filtering decisions.

17. **Regarding dependent claim 19,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

18. **Regarding dependent claim 24,** it is a system which is capable of executing the method of claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.

19. **Claims 9-10 and 20-21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graber et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kirsch et al. (USPN 5,751,956 – filing date 2/21/1996).**

20. **Regarding dependent claim 9,** Graber discloses the method of claim 1. Graber fails to disclose that the redirecting step would comprise sending to a user a string that includes

the forwarding URL. In col. 10, lines 30-35, Kirsch et al. teach how a URL is "issued

back to the client system", in order to issue a redirection request. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the user a

string that includes the forwarding URL.

21. **Regarding dependent claim 20,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-

executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 4, and is rejected under

the same rationale.

22. **Regarding dependent claim 10,** Graber discloses the method of claim 1. Graber fails to

disclose that the redirecting step would comprise sending to a user a string that includes

the forwarding URL using http. In col. 10, lines 30-35, Kirsch et al. teach how a URL is

"issued back to the client system", which is done by http in the context of the invention,

in order to issue a redirection request. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to send the user a string that includes the

forwarding URL using a hypertext transfer protocol location command.

23. **Regarding dependent claim 21,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-

executable inst ructions for performing the steps recited in claim 10, and is rejected under

the same rationale.

24. **Claims 11 and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Graber et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fogg et al.

(USPN 6,321,242 – filing date 2/6/1998).

25. **Regarding dependent claim 11,** Graber discloses the method of claim 1. Graber's work

lacks the feature of explicitly stating that the user provides the web request. In lines 60-

65, Fogg et al. describe how it is common practice for a user to send a "request message

to the receiving site" by "clicking on a hypertext link", in order to retrieve a document.

Hence it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to

have the user supply the request in order to select a document .

26. **Regarding dependent claim 22,** it is a computer-readable medium having computer-

executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 11, and is rejected under

the same rationale.

Response to Amendment

27. Applicant's arguments filed 10/10/2003 have been carefully and fully considered, but are

not persuasive.

28. Applicant argues that the references cited by the examiner fail to disclose the features of

"receiving a request destined to a first web address including a domain name and a

uniform resource identifier (URI)," "determining a forwarding uniform uniform resource

locator (URL) that corresponds to the domain name," "combining the forwarding uniform

resource locator (URL) and the uniform resource identifier (URI) to form a second web

address" and "redirecting the request to the second web address". The examiner notes

that these features may be found as noted in the rejection of independent claim 1, in

Graber, col. 3, lines 19-21, lines 27-29, and lines 31-34.

29. Applicant argues that Graber presents a deficient 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection for claims 1,

12, 23, and 24 because Graber fails to specify whether a user can be redirected from a

first web address to a second web address by replacing the domain name of the first web

address with a forwarding uniform resource locator without changing the uniform

resource identifier. However, Graber notes in col. 3, lines 27-31, "A destination URL is

formed with redirecting means by substituting the destination URL portion in place of the

second portion in the current URL, wherein the destination URL represents a relative

address of the second location on the WWW." It follows that if the redirection involved

no change in the URI, this would be reflected when the destination URL is constructed

and the destination URL would involve no change in the URI. Hence, the applicant's

argument is invalid.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jonathan D Schlaifer whose telephone number is 703-305-9777.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular

communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

JS

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER